

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/768,039	02/02/2004	Miho Watanabe	118506	6320
25944 75	590 02/16/2006		EXAMINER	
	RRIDGE, PLC	OLSEN, ALLAN W		
P.O. BOX 19928 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1763	

DATE MAILED: 02/16/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	•				
ET AL.					
ce address					
TY (30) DAYS,					
this communication.					
o the merits is					
(a). 37 CFR 1.121(d). m PTO-152.					
onal Stage					

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	10/768,039	WATANABE ET AL.		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Allan Olsen	1763		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E  Disposition of Claims  4) Claim(s) 1-87 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray  5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) 1-87 are subject to restriction and/or of the specification is objected to by the Examine  10) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) according a condition of the specification is objected to by the Examine  11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine according to the specification is objected	Allan Olsen  Pears on the cover sheet with apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDONE of date of this communication, even if timely filed the cover sheet with a communication, even if timely filed the cover sheet with a communication, even if timely filed the cover sheet with a cover sheet with a cover sheet with a cover sheet with the cover	Torrespondence address  (S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, N. nely filed  the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).  It, may reduce any  Examiner.  e 37 CFR 1.85(a).  jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  Action or form PTO-152.		
<ol> <li>Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li> <li>Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage</li> </ol>				
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.				
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4)  Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Di 5)  Notice of Informal F 6)  Other:			
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 7-05) Office Ac	etion Summary Pa	art of Paper No./Mail Date 20060215		

Art Unit: 1763

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-15, 32 and 67-74 drawn to a carbon nanotube structure, classified in class 977, subclass 745.
- II. Claims 16-31, 33-40 and 67-74, drawn to a method of manufacturing a carbon nanotube structure, classified in class 216, subclass 081.
- III. Claims 75-87, drawn to a solution comprising surface functionalized carbon nanotubes, classified in class 977, subclass 786.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make another and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the process could yield a linear structure rather than mesh structure of the claimed product.

Inventions III and I are related as mutually exclusive species in an intermediate-final product relationship. Distinctness is proven for claims in this relationship if the intermediate product is useful to make other than the final product, and the species are patentably distinct (MPEP § 806.05(j)). In the instant case, the intermediate product is deemed to be useful for generating a linear structure of linked nanotubes rather than the mesh structure of the Group III invention and the inventions are deemed patentably distinct because there is nothing on this record to show them to be obvious variants.

Art Unit: 1763

Inventions III and II are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case the product can be used to in a process whereby the liquid solution comprising nanotubes is used to create a dispersion of nanotubes in a solid medium.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

This application contains claims directed to patentably distinct species of the chemical bond that links nanotubes. The species are recited in claims 2-5.

This application contains claims directed to patentably distinct species of the type chemical reaction that occurs when nanotubes are linked. The species are recited in claims 7, 9, 11 and 13.

This application contains claims directed to patentably distinct species of the functional group on a nanotube's surface. The species are recited in claims 8, 10, 12 and 14.

Art Unit: 1763

For <u>each</u> of the above, Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that are elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species.

MPEP § 809.02(a).

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Art Unit: 1763

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Allan Olsen whose telephone number is 571-272-1441. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 1-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Parviz Hassanzadeh can be reached on 571-272-1435. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/768,039 Page 6

**Art Unit: 1763** 

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Marchan

Allan Olsen Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1763